

REMARKS

The claims remaining in the present application are Claims 1-28. Claims 24-28 have been added. Claim 1 has been amended. The specification has been amended. No new matter has been added as a result of these claim amendments.

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY

On May 18, 2004, Ronald Pomerenke, representative for the Applicants, and Applicant Samir Mehta, conducted a telephonic interview with Examiners Phuong Hoang and Sue Lao. Claims 1 and 20 were discussed with respect to Mowbray, "The Essential CORBA." The Examiners agreed to FAX pages 231-249 of the Mowbray reference to the Applicants, which the Applicants have received. Applicants thank the Examiners for their time and consideration.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Mowbray, "The Essential CORBA," pages 35-53, 184-187, 212-213, and 250-255 (hereinafter, Mowbray), in view of UCS, "UCS Architecture" pages 1-2 (hereinafter, UCS). The rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons below.

Amended Independent Claim 1 recites:

A method for allowing communication between a Practical Extraction Report Language (PERL) program and a distributed object, comprising the steps of:

- a) receiving a request from said PERL program, said request specifying said distributed object;
- b) translating said request from said PERL program to a format which is suitable for use with a Common Object Request Broker Architecture (CORBA), wherein said translating comprises translating from PERL to an intermediate language and translating from said intermediate language to the format that is suitable for the CORBA;
- c) making a call to access said distributed object via the Common Object Request Broker Architecture (CORBA);
- d) receiving a response from said call in said step c);
- e) translating said response to a form which is substantially compliant with the Practical Extraction Report Language; and
- f) passing said translated response from said step e) to said PERL program.

Claim 1 has been amended to add, "wherein said translating comprises translating from PERL to an intermediate language and translating from said intermediate language to the format that is suitable for the CORBA."

Support for the amendment to Claim 1 may be found in the specification at least at page 11, lines 23-25.

Mowbray may disclose certain object wrapper techniques in Chapter 8. In Chapter 8, Mowbray provides some detailed examples for wrapping with techniques other than scripts. However, Applicants respectfully assert that Mowbray fails to teach or suggest the claimed limitation of, "translating said request from said PERL program to a format which is suitable for use with a Common Object Request Broker Architecture

(CORBA).” Mowbray’s entire disclosure of wrapping with scripts consists of only three paragraphs from page 253-254. In particular, Mowbray’s discussion involves an example of a scriptable application called Rapport. As Mowbray indicates, Rapport is an integrated package that offers object-oriented capabilities with a word processor, e-mail, spreadsheet, and graphics. Mowbray indicates that Rapport has a *script API*. However, Mowbray does not indicate that Rapport is a script language. Further, *it is Applicants’ understanding that Rapport is not a scripting language*, as is the claimed language PERL.

Thus, Applicants do not understand the passage at page of Mowbray 253-254 to provide any guidance as to providing a mapping between OMG IDL and a scripting language. Considering Mowbray’s example of Rapport in more detail, Mowbray discloses that a server connects to Rapport and sends two script commands. One script command opens the word processing window, the other loads the file. The result is that the Rapport window pops up and the image is read in. Applicants respectfully assert that this teaching or other teachings in Mowbray do not teach or suggest the claimed limitation of, “translating said request from said PERL program to a format which is suitable for use with a Common Object Request Broker Architecture (CORBA).”

As Applicants have argued in a previous response, Mowbray from pages 35-53 does not teach or suggest the presently discussed claim limitation. At page 38, Mowbray discloses that vendors have implemented mappings from OMG (Object Management Group) IDL (Interface Definition Language) to programming languages such as C, C++, and Smalltalk. However, Applicants note that Mowbray fails to mention PERL as one of the languages for which a mapping currently exists. Further, Applicants note that the above list of languages Mowbray provides does not include any scripting languages.

Mowbray may suggest at the top of page 39 that potentially there could be a mapping from OMG IDL to other programming languages. However, Applicants do not understand Mowbray to provide any teaching or suggestion as to how such potential mappings could be accomplished. Applicants note that Mowbray is silent in this passage as to the possibility for mappings between OMG IDL and scripting languages. The rejection appears to respond to the Applicants argument by asserting that Mowbray at page 253-254 explains how such potential mappings could be accomplished. However, for reasons discussed above, Mowbray at page 253-254 or elsewhere is not believed to explain how such mappings could be accomplished.

For reasons above, Mowbray fails to teach or suggest, “translating a request from either a scripting language or a PERL program to a format which is suitable for use with a Common Object Request Broker Architecture (CORBA).” The combination of Mowbray and UCS fails to teach “translating a request from a PERL program to a format which is suitable for use with a Common Object Request Broker Architecture (CORBA),” as claimed. This is because even if UCS were to be combined with Mowbray, the combination would not result in the claimed limitation. The reason for this is that although UCS may assert that PERL is a scripting language, neither UCS nor Mowbray teach or suggest translating a request from either PERL or a scripting language to a format suitable for CORBA.

Claim 1 further recites, “wherein said translating comprises translating from PERL to an intermediate language and translating from said intermediate language to the format that is suitable for the CORBA.” Applicants respectfully assert that this claim limitation is neither taught nor suggested by the prior art.

For the foregoing rationale, the combination of Mowbray and UCS fails to teach or suggest the limitations of Claim 1. As such, Applicants respectfully request the allowance of Claim 1.

Claim 11 recites, in part:

b) translating said request from said PERL program to a format which is suitable for use with a Common Object Request Broker Architecture (CORBA);

...  
e) translating said response to a form which is substantially compliant with the Practical Extraction Report Language.

For reasons discussed in the response to Claim 1, the combination of Mowbray and UCS fails to teach or suggest the limitations of Claim 11. As such, Applicants respectfully request the allowance of Claim 11.

Claim 20 recites, in part:

a) means for translating a call from said PERL program to a format substantially compliant with a Common Object Request Broker Architecture (CORBA); and

b) means for translating a response from said call to a format substantially compliant with the Practical Extraction Report Language.

For reasons discussed in the response to Claim 1, the combination of Mowbray and UCS fails to teach or suggest the limitations of Claim 20. As such, Applicants respectfully request the allowance of Claim 20.

Claims 2-10, 12-19, and 21-23 depend from Claims 1, 11, and 20, which are believed to be allowable for the foregoing reasons. By virtue of their dependencies, Claims 2-10, 12-19, and 21-23 are believed to be allowable and Applicants earnestly request their allowance.

NEW CLAIMS

Claims 24-28 have been added. Support for New Claims 24 and 25 may be found in the specification at least at page 25, lines 36-42. Support for new Claim 26 may be found in the specification at least at page 11, lines 23-25 of the specification. Support for the new Claims 27 and 28 may be found in the specification at least at page 13, lines 10-15.

Claims 24-28 depend from Claim 1, which is respectfully believed to be allowable for reasons discussed herein. Claims 24-28 are believed to be allowable as a result of their dependency on Claim 1.

CONCLUSION

Based on the amendments and arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-28 overcome the rejections of record. Therefore, allowance of Claims 1-28 is respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant amendment and response, the Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,  
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: 6/10, 2004

  
Ronald M. Pomerenke  
Registration No. 43,009

Address: WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP  
Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, California 95113

Telephone: (408) 938-9060 Voice  
(408) 938-9069 Facsimile